



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Hn

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,450	12/26/2000	Reinhard Buendgen	DE9-1999-0087	4189
877	7590	06/20/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598			ALI, SYED J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2195		
DATE MAILED: 06/20/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/748,450	BUENDGEN, REINHARD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Syed J. Ali	2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 16, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.
  
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. **Claims 1-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**
  
4. As per claims 1-7, the phrase “at least one parallel method” is ambiguous, as the claim is directed to “a method.” The redundancy of the claim language used leaves the claim in an ambiguous state, as the same word is used to convey different meanings. It is recommended that the “parallel method” be reworded, e.g. “parallel procedure” or “parallel routine”.

5. As per claims 10-11, the phrase “said method” conveys a meaning that is inconsistent with the antecedent term. In line 3, the “method” appears to be a parallel procedure, while the body of the claim indicates that the method is actually a series of steps, similar to the method of claim 1. This ambiguity should be resolved by making it clear if the “method” is a series of steps to obtain a useful result or a software procedure.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

6. **Claims 10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

7. The “computer program” of claim 10 is software per se. The computer program itself is embodied wholly within software, and is not tangibly embodied. Similarly, the program library of claim 11 and the parallel program managing tool of claim 16 are not tangibly embodied. Both may be implemented entirely within software. Claims 13-15 are non-statutory for at least the same reasons as their parent claim, as they fail to present any limitations that resolve the deficiencies of the claim from which they depend.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

8. **Claims 1-2, 6-11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bündgen et al. (“A Fine-Grained Parallel Completion Procedure”) (hereinafter Bündgen).**

9. As per claim 1, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for running in parallel at least one parallel method called by a sequential caller program (§ 1.2; § 2.2), said method comprising:

issuing a dedicated parallelization call to a parallel program manager (§ 2.2; Fig. 2) comprising all control information needed to allow for running said parallel method as a parallel program (Fig. 2), wherein programming of said parallel program manager and said parallel program are independent of the programming of said sequential caller program in at least one of the following aspects: programming language, compilation, linkage, and hardware platforms (§ 2.2).

10. As per claim 2, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 1 further comprising:

serializing input arguments for a subprogram means (Fig. 2, line 7); and  
running said parallel method in parallel on one or more different machines yielding a result (§ 2.2);

returning said result to the caller program (§ 2.2; Fig. 2, line 16); and  
deserializing the result (Fig. 2, line 19).

11. As per claim 6, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 1 in which said dedicated parallelization call is done more than once during the run of said caller program means (§ 3).

12. As per claim 7, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 6 in which parallelization parameters are selectable for each dedicated parallelization call (§ 2.2; Fig. 2).

13. As per claim 8, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 2 further comprising the step of using a program library which comprises program means for performing the steps of serializing input arguments, running said parallel method in parallel, returning said result and deserializing the result (§ 2.2; Fig. 2).

14. As per claim 9, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a distributed computer system arranged for implementing the method of claim 1 (§ 5).

15. As per claim 10, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program comprising code portions adapted for implementing the method of claim 1 (§ 5).

16. As per claim 11, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium comprising a computer readable program for causing a computer to perform the method of claim 1 (§ 5).

17. As per claim 16, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a parallel program managing tool comprising program means for returning results from parallel executable subprogram means to a sequential caller program (§ 2.2; Fig. 2) wherein programming of said

parallel executable subprogram means is independent of the programming of said sequential caller program in at least one of the following aspects: programming language, compilation, linkage, and hardware platforms (§ 2.2).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

18. **Claims 3-5 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bündgen in view of Goldberg et al. (USPN 6,571,232) (hereinafter Goldberg).**

19. As per claim 3, Goldberg teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of generating said parallel method with a script program means which in turn is arranged to invoke a stream editor in order to fill a template means with the code or the name of the method to be computed in parallel (col. 6 lines 41-63).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bündgen and Goldberg since using a script to compile or translate programs into a form suitable for a particular element can be used to preprocess actions, thus speeding up considerably the time it takes to execute actions. Rather than waiting until the program is loaded onto a processing element and then translating the code, the preprocessor generates the appropriate type of code before sending the application out.

21. As per claim 4, Goldberg teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 3, further comprising the step of automatically generating an instantiation of said template means (col. 3 lines 20-23).

22. As per claim 5, Goldberg teaches the invention as claimed, including the method according to claim 4 in which a script is used for generating parallel subprograms (col. 6 lines 41-63).

23. As per claim 12, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a program library comprising at least one of:

an implementation of an application interface for procedural parallel operating environment [POE] calls to a parallel program manager (§§ 2.2, 3; Fig. 2), wherein programming of said application interface is independent of the programming of said parallel program manager in at least one of the following aspects: programming language, compilation, linkage, and hardware platforms (§ 2.2).

24. Goldberg teaches the invention as claimed, including template means for parallel subprogram means and script means for generating parallel subprograms (col. 6 lines 41-63).

25. As per claim 13, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the library according to claim 12 which provides prerequisites to generate user library functions that make parallelism transparent to a caller of said user library functions (§ 2.2).

26. As per claim 14, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including a user library generated by means of the library according to claim 12 (§ 2.2).

27. As per claim 15, Bündgen teaches the invention as claimed, including the library according to claim 12 which said library is a dynamic link library (§ 2.2).

***Response to Arguments***

28. **Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.**

***Conclusion***

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-3769. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Syed Ali  
June 15, 2005

  
MENG-AI T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
SEARCH & REVIEW CENTER 210